

P16793

PATENT

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully present Claims 1-28 for examination in the RCE filed herewith. Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 have been amended herein to more clearly define the scope of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims and remarks presented herein overcome the Examiner's rejections in the Final Office Action dated December 19, 2005 in the parent application.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-20 and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Simpson (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0266399). The Examiner submits that Simpson discloses all elements of these claims. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Once again, the Examiner points to various sections of Simpson as allegedly describing the elements of Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-20 and 22-27. In response to Applicants' previously submitted arguments as to why these sections of Simpson do not disclose the elements of the claimed invention, the Examiner points out that the limitation upon which Applicants rely (i.e., an external data processing device), is not recited in the rejected claims. Applicants thank the Examiner and respectfully submit that as amended herein, Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22 now clearly articulate the element of a data processing device external to the cell phone and coupled to the cell phone via a connection. The figures in the originally filed application and the language in the specification clearly contemplate a data processing device external to the cell phone, thus fully supporting the claim amendments. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit once again that Simpson does not disclose each element of the claimed invention because the data processing devices in Simpson are not "external to the cell phone", as claimed.

Applicants thus reiterate Applicants' previously submitted arguments for why Simpson does not anticipate the claimed invention. Although the Examiner points to item 302 in FIG. 3 of Simpson as teaching "a method/data processing device for managing incoming calls", item 302 appears to refer to the cell phone itself and there is no showing in Simpson that item 302 is coupled to an external data processing device

P16793

PATENT

capable of managing the cell phone calls. Similarly, the various other sections of Simpson highlighted by the Examiner merely describe various elements contained within the cell phone and not a data processing device external to the cell phone and coupled to a cell phone via a connection and capable of managing the cell phone calls, as claimed herein. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22, as amended herein to further clarify the claimed invention, and submit that at least this element in these amended claims is not disclosed in Simpson. Applicants therefore respectfully contend that the Examiner's arguments against these claims are moot and Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections to pending Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-20 and 22-27.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7, 14, 21 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Simpson in further view of Ihara et al (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0185915). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claims 7, 14, 21 and 28 are all dependent claims, depending on independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 22. As a result, (without conceding the propriety of combining Simpson with Ihara), Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of references cannot teach or suggest the elements of these claims. More specifically, as previously discussed, Simpson does not teach at least one element of the independent claims. Since the dependent claims incorporate all the limitations of the independent claims, and since Ihara also does not teach or suggest the missing element of the claims, the combination of Ihara with Simpson cannot teach the elements of the claimed invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to Claims 7, 14, 21 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

P16793

PATENT


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that pending Claims 1-28 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this case. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (714) 669-1261.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 17, 2006


Sharmini N. Green
Senior Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 41,410
(714) 669-1261